U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
White River Field Office
73544 Hwy 64
Meeker, CO 81641

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

NUMBER: CO-110-2005-140-EA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER (optional): COC67999

PROJECT NAME: Repeater Site

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Sixth Principal Meridian, Colorado
T. 4 S, R. 96 W.,
Sec. 31, SE¼SE¼;
Sec. 32, NW¼SW¼.

T. 5 S., R. 96 W.,
Sec. 6, NE¼NE¼.

APPLICANT: EnCana Oil & Gas (USA) Inc.

ISSUES AND CONCERNS (optional): This repeater site will be located in potential sage grouse habitat.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES:

Background/Introduction: The repeater site is needed for better in-field communications for drilling operations.

Proposed Action: The proposed action is for the installation of a 12 foot tall repeater tower. The proposed communications tower will be set in a cement filled rubber tire and will occupy approximately 5 square feet of public land. Access will be from the Divide Road onto an existing 2 track. The 2-track will be used as is without any improvements and won't be accessed more than 4 times a year.

This action will be an amendment to EnCana's existing right-of-way COC76999.

No Action Alternative: Under the no action alternative, the application would be denied and things would remain the same.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT CARRIED FORWARD: None

NEED FOR THE ACTION:

PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW: The Proposed Action is subject to and has been reviewed for conformance with the following plan (43 CFR 1610.5, BLM 1617.3):

Name of Plan: White River Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan (ROD/RMP).

Date Approved: July 1, 1997

Decision Number/Page: 2-49 thru 2-52

Decision Language: "To make public lands available for the siting of public and private facilities through the issuance of applicable land use authorizations, in a manner that provides for reasonable protection of other resource values."

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT / ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES / MITIGATION MEASURES:

STANDARDS FOR PUBLIC LAND HEALTH: In January 1997, Colorado Bureau of Land Management (BLM) approved the Standards for Public Land Health. These standards cover upland soils, riparian systems, plant and animal communities, threatened and endangered species, and water quality. Standards describe conditions needed to sustain public land health and relate to all uses of the public lands. Because a standard exists for these five categories, a finding must be made for each of them in an environmental analysis. These findings are located in specific elements listed below:

CRITICAL ELEMENTS

AIR QUALITY

Affected Environment: The proposed actions are not located within a ten mile radius of any special designation air sheds or non-attainment areas. Use of the existing two-track for installation and maintenance of the repeater may temporarily increase fugitive dust levels. However, the proposed action will not greatly compromise National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for particulate mater which calls for a maximum 24-hour average to be less than or equal to 150 $\mu g/m^3$.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Temporary increases in fugitive dust levels may occur with use of the existing two-track during dry periods. No adverse environmental consequences are anticipated.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None

Mitigation: None

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Affected Environment: The area of the proposed action has not been inventoried at the Class III level. However, previous inventory in the general area suggest that the potential for the presence of significant cultural resources is very limited.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: It is not expected that significant cultural resources will be impacted by the proposed action.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no new impacts to cultural resources under the No Action Alternative.

Mitigation: 1. The operator is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the project operations that they will be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing historic or archaeological sites, or for collecting artifacts. If historic or archaeological materials are uncovered during any project or construction activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities in the immediate area of the find that might further disturb such materials, and immediately contact the authorized officer (AO). Within five working days the AO will inform the operator as to:

- whether the materials appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places
- the mitigation measures the operator will likely have to undertake before the site can be used (assuming in situ preservation is not necessary)
- a timeframe for the AO to complete an expedited review under 36 CFR 800-11 to confirm, through the State Historic Preservation Officer, that the findings of the AO are correct and that mitigation is appropriate.

If the operator wishes, at any time, to relocate activities to avoid the expense of mitigation and/or the delays associated with this process, the AO will assume responsibility for whatever recordation and stabilization of the exposed materials may be required. Otherwise, the operator will be responsible for mitigation cost. The AO will provide technical and procedural guidelines for the conduct of mitigation. Upon verification from the AO that the required mitigation has been completed, the operator will then be allowed to resume construction.

2. Pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(g) the holder of this authorization must notify the AO, by telephone, with written confirmation, immediately upon the discovery of human remains, funerary items, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony. Further, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(c) and (d), you must stop activities in the vicinity of the discovery and protect it for 30 days or until notified to proceed by the authorized officer.

INVASIVE, NON-NATIVE SPECIES

Affected Environment: There are no known noxious weeds or invasive species at the site of the proposed action.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: In the absence of suitable revegetation, noxious weeds could establish and proliferate on areas of soil disturbance as a result of the proposed action.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There will be no change from the present situation.

Mitigation: Promptly revegetate all disturbed areas not necessary for production with Native Seed mix #2, substituting Letterman needlegrass for green needlegrass. The operator will be required to eradicate all noxious and invasive species which occur on site using materials and methods approved in advance by the Authorized Officer.

MIGRATORY BIRDS

Affected Environment: The project area consists primarily of mountain big sagebrush with low densities of serviceberry scattered throughout. There are a number of migratory birds that fulfill nesting functions in these types from May through mid-July, including several species identified as having higher conservation interest by the Rocky Mountain Bird Observatory, Partners in Flight program (e.g., Brewer's sparrow and sage sparrow). These and more common and generalized species associated with these habitats are widely represented at appropriate densities in extensive suitable habitats throughout the Resource Area.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Although work is scheduled to begin during the latter part of the nesting season (late June to early July), it is highly unlikely that this project would have any negative impacts on nesting birds. There is no surface disturbance associated with this action. In addition, the site is located along an existing two-track, an area that typically assumes little nesting activity.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no conceivable influence on migratory birds or their habitats under the no action alternative.

Mitigation: None

THREATENED, ENDANGERED, AND SENSITIVE ANIMAL SPECIES (includes a finding on Standard 4)

Affected Environment: The project area is broadly encompassed by mountain big sagebrush with scattered serviceberry throughout. There are no endangered or threatened species that are known to inhabit or derive important use from this area.

The project area supports greater sage-grouse populations, a BLM sensitive species. This area constitutes both sage-grouse nesting and brood-rearing habitat. In addition, Access to the repeater site (along Divide Road) bisects two sage-grouse lek sites.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: It is unlikely that the proposed action will have any negative impacts on greater sage-grouse or their habitats. There is no surface disturbance associated with the action. Furthermore, work is schedule to be completed in <2 hours. The two lek sites located along Divide Road would not be occupied this late in the season.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no conceivable influence on special status species under the no action alternative.

Mitigation: If it is necessary to access the repeater site during the sage-grouse lekking season (15 March – 15 May), it is recommended that all vehicle travel to the site take place between the hours of 9:00 am – 4:00 pm as not to disturb/displace any displaying male sage-grouse.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for Threatened & Endangered species: The proposed and no-action alternatives would have no influence on special status species or associated habitats and, as such, would have no influence on applicable land health standards.

WASTES, HAZARDOUS OR SOLID

Affected Environment: There are no known hazardous or other solid wastes on the subject lands. No hazardous materials are known to have been used, stored or disposed of at sites included in the project area.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: No listed or extremely hazardous materials in excess of threshold quantities are proposed for use in this project. While commercial preparations of fuels and lubricants proposed for use may contain some hazardous constituents, they would be stored, used and transported in a manner consistent with applicable laws, and the generation of hazardous wastes would not be anticipated. Solid wastes would be properly disposed of.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: No hazardous or other solid wastes would be generated under the no-action alternative.

Mitigation: The applicant shall be required to collect and properly dispose of any solid wastes generated by the proposed actions.

WATER QUALITY, SURFACE AND GROUND (includes a finding on Standard 5)

Affected Environment: Surface Water: The proposed action will affect the Stewart Gulch and West Fork Parachute Creek watersheds. Stewart Gulch is a tributary to Piceance Creek (tributary to the White River) and is located within stream segment 17 of the White River Basin. West Fork Parachute Creek is a tributary to Parachute Creek (tributary to the Colorado River) and can be found in stream segment 4a of the Colorado River Basin. A review of the Colorado's 1989 Nonpoint Source Assessment Report (plus updates), the 305(b) report, the 303(d) list and the Unified Watershed Assessment was done to see if any water quality concerns have been identified. The State has classified stream segment 17 of the White River Basin as "Use Protected" and further designated as beneficial for the following uses: Cold Aquatic Life 2, Recreation 2, and Agriculture. Stream segment 4a of the Colorado River Basin is NOT listed as "Use Protected" and has been designated as beneficial for: Cold Aquatic Life 2, Recreation 2, Water Supply, and Agriculture. The antidegredation review requirements in the Antidegredation Rule are not applicable to waters designated "Use Protected". For those waters, only the protection specified in each reach will apply. For both of these reaches, minimum standards for four parameters have been listed. These parameters are: dissolved oxygen = 6.0 mg/l, pH = 6.5 - 9.0, Fecal Coliform = 2000/100 ml, and 630/100 ml E. coli.

Ground Water: The proposed action is located in an area of local ground water recharge. Installation and maintenance will not affect recharge.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Ruts will develop along portions of the access route if it is used when soils are saturated. Rut development will channelize water down the roadway. Head cuts and gullies will form at locations water exits the roadway. Development of head cuts and gullies will increase sediment loads to the head waters of the affected watersheds.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None

Mitigation: Avoid using existing two-track during wet periods. Alternate methods of travel (ATVs) are suggested if maintenance is necessary when soils are saturated.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for water quality: Water quality within the area of the proposed action currently meets standards set by the state. The occasional use of the existing two-track to install/maintain the repeater site will not compromise water quality following proper mitigation.

WETLANDS AND RIPARIAN ZONES (includes a finding on Standard 2)

Affected Environment: There are no wetlands or riparian communities directly or involved or potentially influenced by the proposed action.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed action would have no conceivable influence on wetlands or riparian areas.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no conceivable influence on wetlands or riparian communities under the no action alternative.

Mitigation: None

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for riparian systems: This project would have no conceivable potential for influencing wetlands or riparian habitats addressed in the Standards.

CRITICAL ELEMENTS NOT PRESENT OR NOT AFFECTED:

No ACEC's, flood plains, prime and unique farmlands, or Wild and Scenic Rivers, threatened, endangered or sensitive plants exist within the area affected by the proposed action. For threatened, endangered and sensitive plant species Public Land Health Standard is not applicable since neither the proposed nor the no-action alternative would have any influence on populations of, or habitats potentially occupied by, special status plants. There are also no Native American religious or environmental justice concerns associated with the proposed action.

NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS

The following elements **must** be addressed due to the involvement of Standards for Public Land Health:

SOILS (includes a finding on Standard 1)

Affected Environment: The following data is a product of an order III soil survey conducted by the NRCS in Garfield County, CO. The accompanying table highlights important soil characteristics. A complete summary of this information can be found at the White River Field Office.

Soil Number	Soil Name	Slope	Ecological site	Salinity	Run Off	Erosion Potential	Bedrock
55	Parachute-Irigul complex	5-30%	Mountain Loam and Loamy Slopes	0	Medium-Rapid	Moderate-Very Severe	13-25"

55 – Parachute-Irigul complex (5 to 30 percent slopes) can be found on mountain ridges and on the crests and sides of hills. The native vegetation is mainly grass and shrubs.

This unit is about 60 percent Parachute soil and 30 percent Irigul soil. The Parachute soil is on the mountain ridges, and the Irigul soil is on the convex crests and mountainsides. The two soils occur as areas so intricately intermingled that mapping them separately was not practical at the scale used.

Included in mapping are small areas of Rhone loam, Silas loam, and Northwater loam. Included areas make up about 10 percent of the total acreage of this unit.

The Parachute soil is moderately deep and is well drained. It formed in residuum derived dominantly from sandstone, siltstone, or hard shale. Typically the surface layer is grayish brown loam about 10 inches thick. The subsoil is brown very channery loam about 15 inches thick. Rippable, fractured siltstone is at a depth of about 25 inches.

Permeability is moderate in the Parachute soil. The available water capacity is very low. The effective rooting depth is 20 to 40 inches. Runoff is medium or rapid, and the hazard of water erosion is moderate to very severe.

The Irigul soil is shallow and well drained. It formed in residuum derived dominantly from sandstone or hard shale. Typically, the surface layer is brown channery loam about 6 inches thick. The subsoil is brown very channery loam about 7 inches thick. Hard siltstone is at a depth of about 13 inches.

Permeability is moderate in the Irigul soil. The available water capacity is very low. The effective rooting depth is 10 to 20 inches. Runoff is medium or rapid, and the hazard of water erosion is moderate to very severe.

The potential plant community on the Parachute soil is mainly Arizona fescue, Columbia needle grass, slender wheatgrass, Letterman's needle grass, and mountain big sagebrush. If range condition declines as a result of overgrazing, less palatable grasses, such as bottlebrush squirrel tail, forbs, and most of the shrubs increase.

The potential plant community on the Irigul soil is mainly western wheatgrass, prairie Junegrass, blue-bunch wheatgrass, Saskatoon serviceberry, and mountain big sagebrush. If range condition declines as a result of overgrazing, forbs, rabbit brush, mountain big sagebrush, mountain snowberry, and Saskatoon serviceberry will increase

The upper 18 inches of the Parachute soil is a good source of reconstruction material for drastically disturbed areas. Below this depth, however, the Parachute soil is only a fair source of this material because of the limited available water capacity. The Irigul soil is only a fair source of reconstruction material because of the limited available water capacity.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: If installation or maintenance of the repeater site occurs during wet periods, rutting will likely develop along the existing two-track. Given the affected soils low water capacity and moderate to very severe erosion potential, head cutting and gully formation will likely follow rut development.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None

Mitigation: Avoid using existing two-track during wet periods. Alternate methods of travel (ATVs) are suggested if maintenance is necessary when soils are saturated.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for upland soils: Soils in the area of the proposed action currently exhibit infiltration and permeability rates that are appropriate to soil type, climate, landform, and geologic processes. Continued use of the existing two-track to install/maintain the proposed repeater site may slightly decrease infiltration and permeability rates along the access route. However, the affected environment is very small and no significant threat to the overall health of upland soils will result.

VEGETATION (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: The predominate vegetation at the project site is mixed mountain big sagebrush/Utah serviceberry with a fairly diverse understory of native grasses and forbs. The corresponding range site is Brushy Loam. The vegetation is in a mid seral state.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed action will create minor disturbance. The principal negative impact to vegetation that could occur would be the result of invasion of noxious weeds onto the site in the absence of effective revegetation.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There will be no change from the present situation.

Mitigation: Promptly revegetate all disturbed areas not necessary for production with Native Seed mix #2. The operator will be required to eradicate all noxious and invasive species which occur on site using materials and methods approved in advance by the Authorized Officer.

2	Western wheatgrass (Rosanna) Indian ricegrass (Rimrock) Bluebunch wheatgrass (Whitmar) Thickspike wheatgrass (Critana) Letterman needlegrass (ACLE9) Globemallow	2 1 2 2 1 0.5	Deep Loam, Loamy 10"-14", Loamy Breaks, Loamy Slopes, Rolling Loam, Valley Bench

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Wildlife, Aquatic and Wildlife, Terrestrial)*:* Vegetation in the project area currently meets the Standard on a watershed basis and is expected to continue to meet the Standard in the future following implementation of the proposed action.

WILDLIFE, AQUATIC (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: There are no aquatic habitats directly involved or potentially affected by the proposed action.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed action would have no conceivable influence on aquatic wildlife or habitats.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no conceivable influence on aquatic wildlife or habitats under the no action alternative.

Mitigation: None

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Terrestrial): This project would have no conceivable potential for influencing aquatic wildlife or habitats addressed in the Standards.

WILDLIFE, TERRESTRIAL (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: Vegetation associated with the proposed action is broadly encompassed by mountain big sagebrush with low densities of serviceberry scattered throughout. The area provides summer range for deer (15 May through 15 August and winter range for elk (generally November and December). There is no suitable nesting substrate available for raptors in the vicinity of the project area. Non-game wildlife using this area are typical and widely distributed in extensive like habitats across the Resource Area and northwest Colorado; there are no narrowly endemic or highly specialized species known to inhabit those lands potentially influenced by this action.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: It is unlikely the proposed action will have any negative effects on terrestrial wildlife or associated habitats. The repeater site is situated adjacent to an existing two-track and does not involve any surface disturbance. There would be no reduction in the herbaceous and woody forage base for big game. Similarly, there would be no loss of forage or cover for non-game species.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no conceivable influence on wildlife or associated habitats under the no action alternative.

Mitigation: None

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Aquatic): The project area presently meets the public land health standards for terrestrial animal communities. As conditioned, the proposed action would have negligible long term influence on the utility or function of big game, raptor, or non-game habitats surrounding this site. In an overall context, lands affected by the no-action or proposed action would continue to meet the land health standard for terrestrial animals.

OTHER NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS: For the following elements, only those brought forward for analysis will be addressed further.

Non-Critical Element	NA or Not Present	Applicable or Present, No Impact	Applicable & Present and Brought Forward for Analysis
Access and Transportation		X	
Cadastral Survey	X		
Fire Management	X		
Forest Management	X		
Geology and Minerals	X		
Hydrology/Water Rights		X	
Law Enforcement		X	
Noise	X		
Paleontology			X
Rangeland Management		X	
Realty Authorizations	X		
Recreation		X	
Socio-Economics		X	
Visual Resources			X
Wild Horses	X		

PALEONTOLOGY

Affected Environment: The proposed action is in an area generally mapped as the Uinta Formation (Tweto 1979) which the BLM has classified as a Category I formation, meaning it is a known producer of scientifically important fossil resources. The proposed action is also in an area where tongues of the Green River Formation, also classified as a Condition I formation, is occasionally exposed.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: If for any reason it becomes necessary to excavate into the underlying rock formations there is the potential to impact scientifically important formations. If the proposed access road and tower location cross exposed outcrops of rock there is a potential to impact scientifically important fossil resources.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no new impacts to fossil resources under the No Action Alternative.

Mitigation: 1. The operator is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the project operations that they will be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing paleontological sites, or for collecting fossils. If fossil materials are uncovered during any project or construction activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities in the immediate area of the find that might further disturb such materials, and immediately contact the authorized officer (AO). Within five working days the AO will inform the operator as to:

- whether the materials appear to be of noteworthy scientific interest
- the mitigation measures the operator will likely have to undertake before the site can be used (assuming in situ preservation is not feasible)

If the operator wishes, at any time, to relocate activities to avoid the expense of mitigation and/or the delays associated with this process, the AO will assume responsibility for whatever recordation and stabilization of the exposed materials may be required. Otherwise, the operator will be responsible for mitigation cost. The AO will provide technical and procedural guidelines for the conduct of mitigation. Upon verification from the AO that the required mitigation has been completed, the operator will then be allowed to resume construction.

VISUAL RESOURCES

Affected Environment: The proposed action is located in an area with a VRM III classification. The objective of this class is to partially retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be moderate. Management activities may attract attention but should not dominate the view of the casual observer. Changes should repeat the basic elements found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed action would be located on the top of a wide ridge with the predominate vegetation being sagebrush. There are no major roads in close proximity that would be traveled by a casual observer. Major motorized activity in the area is comprised of energy related activity, ranching operations, and seasonal hunting in the fall. A casual would be able to see the proposed action, but his/her view would not be dominated by the proposed action. The level of change to the characteristic landscape by the proposed action would be low, and the standards of the VRM III classification would be retained.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts.

Mitigation: None

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS SUMMARY: This action is consistent with the scope of impacts addressed in the White River ROD/RMP. The cumulative impacts of oil and gas activities are addressed in the White River ROD/RMP for each resource value that would be affected by the proposed action.

REFERENCES CITED

Tweto, Ogden
1979 Geologic Map of Colorado. United States Geologic Survey, United States Department of the Interior, Reston, Virginia.

PERSONS / AGENCIES CONSULTED:

INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:

Name	Title	Area of Responsibility
Nate Dieterich	Hydrologist	Air Quality
Tamara Meagley	Natural Resource Specialist	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern
Tamara Meagley	Natural Resource Specialist	Threatened and Endangered Plant Species
Michael Selle	Archeologist	Cultural Resources Paleontological Resources
Mark Hafkenschiel	Rangeland Management Specialist	Invasive, Non-Native Species; Vegetation, Rangeland Management
Lisa Belmonte	Wildlife Biologist	Migratory Birds
Lisa Belmonte	Wildlife Biologist	Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Animal Species, Wildlife
Bo Brown	Petroleum Engineer Tech/Hazmat Collateral	Wastes, Hazardous or Solid
Nate Dieterich	Hydrologist	Water Quality, Surface and Ground Hydrology and Water Rights
Lisa Belmonte	Wildlife Biologist	Wetlands and Riparian Zones
Chris Ham	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Wilderness
Nate Dieterich	Hydrologist	Soils
Lisa Belmonte	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife Terrestrial and Aquatic
Chris Ham	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Access and Transportation
Ken Holsinger	Natural Resource Specialist	Fire Management
Robert Fowler	Forester	Forest Management
Paul Daggett	Mining Engineer	Geology and Minerals
Penny Brown	Realty Specialist	Realty Authorizations
Chris Ham	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation
Keith Whitaker	Natural Resource Specialist	Visual Resources
Valerie Dobrich	Natural Resource Specialist	Wild Horses

Finding of No Significant Impact/Decision Record (FONSI/DR)

CO-110-2005-140-EA

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)/RATIONALE: The environmental assessment and analyzing the environmental effects of the proposed action have been reviewed. The approved mitigation measures (listed below) result in a Finding of No Significant Impact on the human environment. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not necessary to further analyze the environmental effects of the proposed action.

DECISION/RATIONALE: It is my decision to approve the proposed action with the mitigation measures listed below.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

1. The operator is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the project operations that they will be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing historic or archaeological sites, or for collecting artifacts. If historic or archaeological materials are uncovered during any project or construction activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities in the immediate area of the find that might further disturb such materials, and immediately contact the authorized officer (AO). Within five working days the AO will inform the operator as to:

- whether the materials appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places
- the mitigation measures the operator will likely have to undertake before the site can be used (assuming in situ preservation is not necessary)
- a timeframe for the AO to complete an expedited review under 36 CFR 800-11 to confirm, through the State Historic Preservation Officer, that the findings of the AO are correct and that mitigation is appropriate.

If the operator wishes, at any time, to relocate activities to avoid the expense of mitigation and/or the delays associated with this process, the AO will assume responsibility for whatever recordation and stabilization of the exposed materials may be required. Otherwise, the operator will be responsible for mitigation cost. The AO will provide technical and procedural guidelines for the conduct of mitigation. Upon verification from the AO that the required mitigation has been completed, the operator will then be allowed to resume construction.

2. Pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(g) the holder of this authorization must notify the AO, by telephone, with written confirmation, immediately upon the discovery of human remains, funerary items, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony. Further, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(c) and (d), you must stop activities in the vicinity of the discovery and protect it for 30 days or until notified to proceed by the authorized officer.

3. Promptly revegetate all disturbed areas not necessary for production with Native Seed mix #2, substituting Letterman needlegrass for green needlegrass. The operator will be required to eradicate all noxious and invasive species which occur on site using materials and methods approved in advance by the Authorized Officer.

4. If it is necessary to access the repeater site during the sage-grouse lekking season (15 March – 15 May), all vehicle travel to the site shall take place between the hours of 9:00 am – 4:00 pm as not to disturb/displace any displaying male sage-grouse.

5. The applicant shall be required to collect and properly dispose of any solid wastes generated by the proposed actions.

6. Avoid using existing two-track during wet periods. Alternate methods of travel (ATVs) are suggested if maintenance is necessary when soils are saturated.

7. Promptly revegetate all disturbed areas not necessary for production with Native Seed mix #2. The operator will be required to eradicate all noxious and invasive species which occur on site using materials and methods approved in advance by the Authorized Officer.

Native Seed mix #2			
2	Western wheatgrass (Rosanna) Indian ricegrass (Rimrock) Bluebunch wheatgrass (Whitmar) Thickspike wheatgrass (Critana) Letterman needlegrass (ACLE9) Globemallow	2 1 2 2 1 0.5	Deep Loam, Loamy 10"-14", Loamy Breaks, Loamy Slopes, Rolling Loam, Valley Bench

8. The operator is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the project operations that they will be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing paleontological sites, or for collecting fossils. If fossil materials are uncovered during any project or construction activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities in the immediate area of the find that might further disturb such materials, and immediately contact the authorized officer (AO). Within five working days the AO will inform the operator as to:

- whether the materials appear to be of noteworthy scientific interest
- the mitigation measures the operator will likely have to undertake before the site can be used (assuming in situ preservation is not feasible)

If the operator wishes, at any time, to relocate activities to avoid the expense of mitigation and/or the delays associated with this process, the AO will assume responsibility for whatever recordation and stabilization of the exposed materials may be required. Otherwise, the operator will be responsible for mitigation cost. The AO will provide technical and procedural guidelines for the conduct of mitigation. Upon verification from the AO that the required mitigation has been completed, the operator will then be allowed to resume construction.

COMPLIANCE/MONITORING: Compliance will be conducted by the realty staff every five years.

NAME OF PREPARER: Penny Brown

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: CAROL HOLLOWED

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL: _____
Field Manager

DATE SIGNED: 6/22/05

ATTACHMENTS:

Maps.

CO-110-2005-140-EA 16